

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION  
CORPORATION,

Plaintiff-Applicant,

v.

BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT  
SECURITIES LLC,

Defendant.

In re:

BERNARD L. MADOFF,

Debtor.

IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee for the Liquidation  
of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UBS AG, UBS (LUXEMBOURG) S.A., UBS  
FUND SERVICES (LUXEMBOURG) S.A., UBS  
THIRD PARTY MANAGEMENT COMPANY  
S.A., M&B CAPITAL ADVISERS SOCIEDAD  
DE VALORES, S.A., RELIANCE  
INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH LLC,  
LUXEMBOURG INVESTMENT FUND AND  
LUXEMBOURG INVESTMENT FUND U.S.  
EQUITY PLUS, as represented by their Liquidators  
MAÎTRE ALAIN RUKAVINA and PAUL  
LAPLUME, MAÎTRE ALAIN RUKAVINA and  
PAUL LAPLUME, in their capacities as liquidators  
and representatives of LUXEMBOURG  
INVESTMENT FUND AND LUXEMBOURG  
INVESTMENT FUND U.S. EQUITY PLUS, and  
LANDMARK INVESTMENT FUND IRELAND,

Defendants.

Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB)

SIPA LIQUIDATION

(Substantively Consolidated)

Adv. Pro. No. 10-05311 (SMB)

**STIPULATED FINAL ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS COUNTS  
TWO, FOUR, ELEVEN AND EIGHTEEN OF THE COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Irving H. Picard (the “Trustee”), as trustee of the substantively consolidated liquidation proceeding of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC (“BLMIS”), under the Securities Investor Protection Act (“SIPA”), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78aaa *et seq.*, and the estate of Bernard L. Madoff, individually, and UBS AG, UBS (Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Fund Services (Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Third Party Management Company S.A., M&B Capital Advisers Sociedad de Valores, S.A., and Reliance Management (Gibraltar) Limited (“Defendants” and with the Trustee, the “Parties”), by and through their respective undersigned counsel, state as follows:

**WHEREAS**, on December 7, 2010, the Trustee initiated the above-captioned adversary proceeding in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the “Bankruptcy Court”) by filing a complaint against Defendants. *See Picard v. UBS AG*, No. 10-05311 (SMB), ECF No. 1;

**WHEREAS**, on May 15, 2012 and June 7, 2012, respectively, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the Honorable Jed S. Rakoff, entered Orders in which he withdrew the reference in certain adversary proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(d) to determine whether SIPA and/or the Bankruptcy Code as incorporated by SIPA apply extraterritorially, permitting the Trustee to avoid initial transfers that were received abroad or to recover from initial, immediate, or mediate foreign transferees (the “Extraterritoriality Issue”). *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, No. 12-mc-0115 (JSR), ECF Nos. 97 and 167;

**WHEREAS**, after consolidated briefing and oral argument on the Extraterritoriality Issue, *see id.*, ECF Nos. 234, 309, 310, 322, and 357, on July 7, 2014, Judge Rakoff entered an Opinion and Order (the “Extraterritoriality Order”) and returned the withdrawn adversary

proceedings to the Bankruptcy Court for further proceedings consistent with the Extraterritoriality Order. *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, 513 B.R. 222 (S.D.N.Y. 2014);

**WHEREAS**, on July 28, 2014, Judge Rakoff entered a Stipulation and Supplemental Opinion and Order in which he supplemented the Extraterritoriality Order to direct that certain additional adversary proceedings should “also be returned to the Bankruptcy Court for further proceedings consistent with” the Extraterritoriality Order. *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, No. 12-mc-0115 (JSR), ECF No. 556;

**WHEREAS**, on December 10, 2014, the Bankruptcy Court entered an Order concerning further proceedings on Extraterritoriality Issue that directed Defendants, the Trustee, and the Securities Investor Protection Corporation to submit supplemental briefing to address (a) which counts asserted in the adversary proceeding against Defendants should be dismissed pursuant to the Extraterritoriality Order or the legal standards announced therein and (b) whether the Trustee shall be permitted to file an amended complaint containing allegations relevant to the Extraterritoriality Issue as proffered by the Trustee (together, the “Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss”). *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB), ECF No. 8800;

**WHEREAS**, on December 31, 2014, Defendants filed a consolidated memorandum of law in support of the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss. *See Picard v. UBS AG et al.*, Adv. Pro. No. 10-05311 (SMB), ECF No. 200;

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to further scheduling Orders, *see Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB), ECF Nos. 8990, 9350, and 9720, on June 26, 2015, the Trustee filed (a) a consolidated memorandum of law in opposition to

the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss, (b) supplemental memoranda in opposition to the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss, and (c) a proposed amended complaint. *See Picard v. UBS AG et al.*, Adv. Pro. No. 10-05311 (SMB), ECF Nos. 217–221;

**WHEREAS**, on September 30, 2015, Defendants filed (a) the consolidated reply memorandum of law in support of the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss and (b) supplemental reply memoranda in support of the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss. *See id.*, ECF Nos. 223, 224, 226;

**WHEREAS**, on December 16, 2015, the Bankruptcy Court heard oral argument on the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss. *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB), ECF No. 12081;

**WHEREAS**, on November 22, 2016, the Bankruptcy Court issued a Memorandum Decision Regarding Claims to Recover Foreign Subsequent Transfers (the “Memorandum Decision”) that granted the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss as to Defendants. *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB), ECF No. 14495;

**WHEREAS**, the Memorandum Decision directed that the Trustee’s claims in this adversary proceeding should be dismissed as to Counts Two and Eleven against UBS AG, UBS (Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Fund Services (Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Third Party Management Company S.A., and Reliance Management (Gibraltar) Limited, and as to Counts Two, Four, Eleven and Eighteen against M&B Capital Advisers Sociedad de Valores, S.A. (the “Dismissed Claims”);

**WHEREAS**, on January 19, 2017, the Trustee filed a notice of voluntary dismissal without prejudice as to Reliance Management (Gibraltar) Limited. *See Picard v. UBS AG*, No. 10-05311 (SMB), ECF No. 239.

**WHEREAS**, the Parties have agreed to consent to the Bankruptcy Court's entry of final orders and judgments consistent with the Memorandum Decision in this adversary proceeding;

**WHEREAS**, the Parties further request that the Bankruptcy Court enter a final judgment solely as to the Dismissed Claims under Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on the grounds that an immediate appellate review of the Memorandum Decision will be efficient for the courts and the Parties;

**NOW**, for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum Decision, which is incorporated herein and attached hereto as Exhibit A, the Parties agree and stipulate and the Bankruptcy Court hereby orders:

1. The Bankruptcy Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this adversary proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 1334(b) and (e)(1) and 15 U.S.C. § 78eee (b)(2)(A) and (b)(4).

2. The Parties expressly and knowingly grant their consent solely for the Bankruptcy Court to enter final orders and judgments with respect to the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss, whether the underlying claims are core under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2) or non-core under 28 U.S.C. § 157(c)(2), subject to appellate review, including under 28 U.S.C. § 158. Notwithstanding the above grant of consent, Defendants reserve all other jurisdictional, substantive, or procedural rights and remedies in connection with this adversary proceeding, including with respect to the Bankruptcy Court's power to finally determine any other matters in this adversary proceeding.

3. The Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED** as to the Dismissed Claims against Defendants.

4. The entry of a final order and judgment dismissing the Dismissed Claims in this adversary proceeding pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b) is appropriate. To permit entry of a final order and judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), there must be multiple claims or multiple parties, at least one claim finally decided within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and an express determination that there is no just reason for delay. *In re Air Crash at Belle Harbor, N.Y.*, 490 F.3d 99, 108–09 (2d Cir. 2007).

5. The operative complaint and the proposed amended complaint filed in this adversary proceeding allege multiple claims and name multiple defendants. The entry of a final order and judgment will finally decide and ultimately dispose of the Dismissed Claims, which present legal issues that can be adjudicated independently of the remaining claims.

6. There is no just reason for delay of entry of a final order and judgment on the Dismissed Claims. In light of the number of adversary proceedings, claims and defendants in the above-captioned substantively consolidated adversary proceeding affected by the Memorandum Decision, the interests of sound judicial administration and the realization of judicial efficiencies are served by the entry of this final order and judgment, together with the entry of all other final orders and judgments dismissing other claims brought by the Trustee in the above-captioned substantively consolidated adversary proceeding pursuant to the Memorandum Decision (“Related Final Orders and Judgments”), and the opportunity for an immediate appeal.

7. Because this order and judgment and the dismissal of the Dismissed Claims, together with Related Final Orders and Judgments, will affect numerous adversary proceedings commenced by the Trustee and hundreds of defendants named in those complaints or proposed

amended complaints, an immediate appeal would avoid protracted, expensive, and potentially duplicative litigation proceedings, and will facilitate the prompt resolution of the case, thereby providing certainty and helping to streamline the litigation for further proceedings and possible appeals.

8. The Parties' request that the Bankruptcy Court enter final orders and judgments solely as to the Dismissed Claims under Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is **GRANTED.**

*[Signature Page Follows]*

Date: New York, New York  
January 20, 2017

By: /s/ David J. Sheehan  
**BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP**  
45 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10111  
Telephone: (212) 589-4200  
Facsimile: (212) 589-4201

David J. Sheehan  
Email: dsheehan@bakerlaw.com  
Oren J. Warshavsky  
Email: owarshavsky@bakerlaw.com  
Geoffrey A. North  
Email: gnorth@bakerlaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Irving H. Picard,  
Trustee for the Substantively Consolidated  
SIPA Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff  
Investment Securities LLC and the Estate  
of Bernard L. Madoff*

By: /s/ Marshall R. King  
**GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP**  
200 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10166  
Telephone: (212) 351-4000  
Facsimile: (212) 351-4035

Marshall R. King  
Email: mking@gibsondunn.com  
Gabriel Herrmann  
Email: gherrmann@gibsondunn.com

*Attorneys for Defendants UBS AG, UBS  
(Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Fund Services  
(Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Third Party Management  
Company S.A.*

By: /s/ Richard B. Levin  
**JENNER & BLOCK LLP**  
919 Third Avenue, 38<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10022  
Telephone: (212) 891-1601  
Facsimile: (212) 891-1699

Richard B. Levin  
Email: rlevin@jenner.com

*Attorneys for M&B Capital Advisers  
Sociedad de Valores, S.A.*

**SO ORDERED**

Dated: March 9<sup>th</sup>, 2017  
New York, New York

/s/ STUART M. BERNSTEIN  
HONORABLE STUART M. BERNSTEIN  
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE